



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,681	01/31/2002	Jennifer Geske	10007033-1	2182

7590 04/01/2008
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

QIN, YIXING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,681

Applicant(s)

GESKE ET AL.

Examiner

Yixing Qin

Art Unit

2625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 12-14 and 16-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 12-14 and 16-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed in the Appeal Brief dated 1/3/08 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,970). The Buckley reference is still used for certain dependent claims because the concepts in Buckley regarding statistical analysis/categorization can still be applied to the Suzuki reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claimed invention in claims 17-22 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed towards an abstract idea. Under the current 101 guidelines (specifically, page 30 "Annex I"), there are three 101 judicial exceptions – law of nature, natural phenomenon, and abstract idea. A program is simply a set of instructions and does not produce a physical transformation or a tangible result. Also, in the current application, the modules could also simply be programs. The suggested correction is to amend the limitations to state that the program is encoded on a computer readable medium and that the modules are hardware.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

I. Claims 1-7, 12, 13, 16, 23-27, 33, 35, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,970) and in view of Buckley (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,173).

Regarding claim 1, Suzuki discloses a method controlling printing of a document, comprising:

processing the document to form a print job including print data, the print data including drawing commands, (Fig. 4 and column 3, lines 38-64 that image data sent from a host is processed and rendering commands are produced.)

Suzuki further discloses in Fig. 4 and column 4, lines 28-36 that using the rendering command (i.e. – analogous to drawing command), data is classified as text or image. However, it does not go into detail into statistical analysis

Thus, it does not explicitly disclose “analyzing the drawing commands to build statistical information about content within the print data; and

categorizing the print job using the statistical information according to pre-specified categorization criteria.”

However, the statistical analysis method of Buckley (Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 56-62) can be applied to the Suzuki reference. Note that Buckley also discloses in Fig. 9, lines 42-53 that documents can be identified as 45% text, 40% photo, and 15% graphics as an example. This method is applicable to Suzuki because either reference is identifying objects in a document to be printed, they just look at different representations of the same item. Suzuki looks at the rendering commands, whereas Buckley looks at the object types. However, one of ordinary skill would recognize that the rendering commands simply describe or define the objects, so that performing statistical analysis on the rendering commands would be an obvious variation. Column 5, lines 45-55 of Buckley discloses that the image objects in a document can be identified by known segmentation techniques, one of which is what Suzuki teaches.

Suzuki and Buckley are combinable because both are in the art of identifying different types of objects in documents for better processing of a document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed statistical analysis on the drawing commands.

The motivation would have been to allow documents to be optimally processed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki and Buckley to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claim 2, Buckley discloses wherein the analyzing the print data to build statistical information is incorporated in a printer driver. (column 8, lines 36-50, especially lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 3, Buckley discloses wherein at least a portion of the printer driver is a software printer driver. (column 8, lines 36-50, especially lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 4, Buckley discloses wherein at least a portion of the printer driver is a firmware printer driver. (column 8, lines 36-50, especially lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 5, Buckley discloses further comprising storing the categorization in a log file. (Fig. 5 – although shown is an user interface with object type and settings, it is inherent that this information is stored in a memory in the form of a file. Also see column 6, lines 41- column 7, line 23).

Regarding claim 6, the Buckley reference discloses “using the categorization information from the log file for examination, building, enhancing and verifying future categorization matches.” (column 6, lines 54-67 and column 7, lines 1-46).

Regarding claims 7, and 24, Buckley discloses further comprising gathering input criteria from a user before a print job is initiated and categorizing the print job based on

the statistical analysis and the input criteria. (column 4, lines 56-62, also column 4, lines 8-55 describes how an user can set parameters for document types)

Regarding claim 8, the Buckley reference discloses the analysis of print data using a printer driver. It does not disclose "classifying the print job as an unknown job type if the categorizing is unsuccessful."

However, Buckley discloses in column 7, lines 47-62 various ways to categorize a document. In lines 55-62, Buckley discloses that it might be possible that a mix content type does not exist (i.e. undefined) and either the document would be printed using a most-predominant or a default type. It is not explicitly stated that Buckley categorizes the document as an unknown job type, but clearly suggests doing so because a document as mentioned in the cited lines cannot be classified in one of the types in the Buckley invention. Thus, while an unknown job type is not explicitly defined, one of ordinary skill would have recognized that a classification could be made for this unknown type.

Under the KSR rationale, this unknown classification would simply be an improvement on the Buckley invention that would yield predictable results. Namely, Buckley teaches image, text, etc classifications. An unknown classification would simply be a new type of classification. Buckley even discloses how to process this type of classification (i.e. print as a pre-dominant or default type), so it should be apparent that adding this new classification would have a clear and predictable improvement to Buckley.

Regarding claim 12, Buckley discloses further including:

processing the log file so as to determine effectiveness of the categorizing; and
(column 6, lines 54-67 and column 7, lines 1-46).

updating the pre-specified categorization criteria so as to improve the
effectiveness of the categorizing. (column 7, lines 24-34).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, Buckley discloses further including:

developing at least one new categorization category. (Fig. 3 shows text/photo
and column 9, lines 42-59 discusses how if additional multi-document types are
implemented and can be automatically selected).

Regarding claim 16, Buckley discloses wherein analyzing and categorizing are
performed before the print job is printed. (column 8, lines 28-35).

Regarding claim 17, Suzuki discloses a system for managing printing operations
on a computer, comprising:

an application program that generates drawing commands for printing a
document, (column 3, lines 27-36, Fig. 4 and column 3, lines 38-64 that image data sent
from a host is processed and rendering commands are produced.)

Suzuki further discloses in Fig. 4 and column 4, lines 28-36 that using the rendering command (i.e. – analogous to drawing command), data is classified as text or image. However, it does not go into detail into statistical analysis

Thus, it does not explicitly disclose "a statistical module that collects drawing commands and collapses the collected drawing commands into pre-determined classifications; and

a filtering module coupled to the statistical module that filters the pre-determined classifications using pre specified category criteria and categorizes the print job into at least one predefined print job category."

However, the statistical analysis method of Buckley (Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 56-62) can be applied to the Suzuki reference. Note that Buckley also discloses in Fig. 9, lines 42-53 that documents can be identified as 45% text, 40% photo, and 15% graphics as an example. This method is applicable to Suzuki because either reference is identifying objects in a document to be printed, they just look at different representations of the same item. Suzuki looks at the rendering commands, whereas Buckley looks at the object types. However, one of ordinary skill would recognize that the rendering commands simply describe or define the objects, so that performing statistical analysis on the rendering commands would be an obvious variation. Column 5, lines 45-55 of Buckley discloses that the image objects in a document can be identified by known segmentation techniques, one of which is what Suzuki teaches.

Suzuki and Buckley are combinable because both are in the art of identifying different types of objects in documents for better processing of a document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed statistical analysis on the drawing commands.

The motivation would have been to allow documents to be optimally processed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki and Buckley to obtain the invention as specified.

Note that although Buckley does not call the items in his invention a statistical and a filtering module, the functions are essentially the same. Please see also, Fig. 2 and column 6, lines 66-67 and column 7, lines 1-23.

Regarding claim 18, Buckley discloses further comprising a secondary filter module that uses the pre-determined classifications and input criteria predefined by a user and relating to the printing operation for categorizing the print job. (column 4, lines 8-62). Again, Buckley does not explicitly have "a secondary filter," but does describe similar functions.

Regarding claim 19, Buckley discloses the system for managing printing operations of claim 17, wherein the drawings commands include at least one of vector

graphics, raster graphics or textual fonts and are predefined by an administrator.
(column 10, lines 26-39 and column 11 lines 66-67 and column 12, lines 1-14).

Regarding claim 20, Buckley discloses the system for managing printing operations of claim 17, wherein the statistical module is incorporated in a software printer driver

Regarding claims 21, Buckley discloses further comprising a client monitoring program that determines whether a new classification category needs to be developed.
(column 8, lines 36-67 to column 11, lines 1-48, especially column 9, lines 42-58).

Regarding claim 23, Buckley discloses in a system for electronically monitoring the contents of a print job generated from a document, a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a process on a computer, the process comprising:

processing the document to form a print job including print data, the print data including drawing commands, (column 3, lines 27-36, Fig. 4 and column 3, lines 38-64 that image data sent from a host is processed and rendering commands are produced.)

Suzuki further discloses in Fig. 4 and column 4, lines 28-36 that using the rendering command (i.e. – analogous to drawing command), data is classified as text or image. However, it does not go into detail into statistical analysis

Thus, it does not explicitly disclose "statistically analyzing the print data to form object type percentages using the drawing commands;

classifying the print job using the statistical analysis and according to pre-specified categorization criteria; and

storing the classification in a log file and using the classification from the log file for examination and for building, enhancing and verifying future classification matches."

However, the statistical analysis method of Buckley (Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 56-62) can be applied to the Suzuki reference. Note that Buckley also discloses in Fig. 9, lines 42-53 that documents can be identified as 45% text, 40% photo, and 15% graphics as an example. This method is applicable to Suzuki because either reference is identifying objects in a document to be printed, they just look at different representations of the same item. Suzuki looks at the rendering commands, whereas Buckley looks at the object types. However, one of ordinary skill would recognize that the rendering commands simply describe or define the objects, so that performing statistical analysis on the rendering commands would be an obvious variation. Column 5, lines 45-55 of Buckley discloses that the image objects in a document can be identified by known segmentation techniques, one of which is what Suzuki teaches.

Buckley further discloses Fig. 5 that although shown is a user interface with object type and settings, it is inherent that this information is stored in a memory in the form of a file. Also see column 6, lines 41- column 7, line 23. In column 6, lines 54-67 and column 7, lines 1-46, Buckley discloses the ability to better classify documents.

Suzuki and Buckley are combinable because both are in the art of identifying different types of objects in documents for better processing of a document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed statistical analysis on the drawing commands.

The motivation would have been to allow documents to be optimally processed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki and Buckley to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claim 25, Buckley discloses the computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the process of claim 24, further comprising:

monitoring all print jobs and providing at least one of an automatic rejection, acceptance or confirmation of the print job as user feedback before the print job is sent to peripheral device. (column 9, lines 42-59).

Regarding claims 27 and 33, Buckley discloses a system for managing print jobs of documents containing at least one page, comprising:

means for collecting drawing commands for a given page; (column 3, lines 27-36, Fig. 4 and column 3, lines 38-64 that image data sent from a host is processed and rendering commands are produced.)

means for collapsing the collected drawing commands into pre-determined categories; (Fig. 4 and column 4, lines 28-36 that using the rendering command (i.e. – analogous to drawing command), data is classified as text or image. However, it does not go into detail into statistical analysis) and

It does not explicitly disclose "means for classifying the print job using the pre-determined classifications. "

However, the statistical analysis method of Buckley (Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 56-62) can be applied to the Suzuki reference. Note that Buckley also discloses in Fig. 9, lines 42-53 that documents can be identified as 45% text, 40% photo, and 15% graphics as an example. This method is applicable to Suzuki because either reference is identifying objects in a document to be printed, they just look at different representations of the same item. Suzuki looks at the rendering commands, whereas Buckley looks at the object types. However, one of ordinary skill would recognize that the rendering commands simply describe or define the objects, so that performing statistical analysis on the rendering commands would be an obvious variation. Column

5, lines 45-55 of Buckley discloses that the image objects in a document can be identified by known segmentation techniques, one of which is what Suzuki teaches.

Buckley further discloses Fig. 5 that although shown is an user interface with object type and settings, it is inherent that this information is stored in a memory in the form of a file. Also see column 6, lines 41- column 7, line 23. In column 6, lines 54-67 and column 7, lines 1-46, Buckley discloses the ability to better classify documents.

Regarding claim 28, Buckley discloses a printing system working in a computer environment, comprising:

- an application program that generates print data for a print job, the print data including drawing commands; (column 3, lines 27-36, Fig. 4 and column 3, lines 38-64 that image data sent from a host is processed and rendering commands are produced.)

- a printer that receives the print data for printing the print jobs; (Fig. 3, item 105)

Suzuki further discloses in Fig. 4 and column 4, lines 28-36 that using the rendering command (i.e. – analogous to drawing command), data is classified as text or image. However, it does not go into detail into statistical analysis

It does not explicitly disclose “a software printer driver coupled to the printer and application program for analyzing the drawing commands to build statistical information about content within the print data; and

a filter module coupled to the software printer driver for categorizing the print job using the statistical information according to pre-specified categorization criteria."

However, the statistical analysis method of Buckley (Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 56-62) can be applied to the Suzuki reference. Note that Buckley also discloses in Fig. 9, lines 42-53 that documents can be identified as 45% text, 40% photo, and 15% graphics as an example. This method is applicable to Suzuki because either reference is identifying objects in a document to be printed, they just look at different representations of the same item. Suzuki looks at the rendering commands, whereas Buckley looks at the object types. However, one of ordinary skill would recognize that the rendering commands simply describe or define the objects, so that performing statistical analysis on the rendering commands would be an obvious variation. Column 5, lines 45-55 of Buckley discloses that the image objects in a document can be identified by known segmentation techniques, one of which is what Suzuki teaches.

Buckley further discloses Fig. 5 that although shown is an user interface with object type and settings, it is inherent that this information is stored in a memory in the form of a file. Also see column 6, lines 41- column 7, line 23. In column 6, lines 54-67 and column 7, lines 1-46, Buckley discloses the ability to better classify documents.

Regarding claim 29, Buckley discloses further comprising a log file that stores the categorization of the print job. (Fig. 5 – although shown is an user interface with object

Art Unit: 2625

type and settings, it is inherent that this information is stored in a memory in the form of a file. Also see column 6, lines 41- column 7, line 23).

Regarding claim 30, the Buckley reference discloses wherein the categorization information from the log file is used for examination, building, enhancing and verifying future categorization matches (column 6, lines 54-67 and column 7, lines 1-46).

Regarding claim 31, Buckley discloses wherein the application program gathers input criteria from a user before a print job is initiated and wherein the filter module categorizes the print job based on the statistical analysis and the input criteria. (column 4, lines 56-62, also column 4, lines 8-55 describes how an user can set parameters for document types)

Regarding claim 32, Buckley discloses a client monitoring program that approves the print job and allows the print job to be printed without user confirmation. (column 8, lines 7-17).

Regarding claim 34, Buckley discloses in column 8, lines 2-7 there is calculation of the raw numbers for either the total number of objects or the total proportion.

It does not explicitly disclose counting the exact types of commands.

However, these commands are command in the printing art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used and counted these commands to determine the type of printing that should take place.

The motivation would have been to enable a printer to print optimally.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to improve Buckley to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claim 35, Buckley discloses and wherein the pre-determined classifications include text, at least one of solid or unfilled circle line/graphics, clip art style images, and photographic images. (column 12, lines 2-14).

Regarding claim 36, Buckley discloses wherein the statistical module sorts the drawing commands by command type, and groups the sorted drawing commands into predetermined object types so as to identify a percentage of the drawing commands that is associated with each of the predetermined object types. (column 8, lines 2-7).

Regarding claim 37, Buckley discloses wherein the filtering module compares the percentage of the drawing commands associated with each of the predetermined object types against predefined percentages associated with the pre specified category criteria so as to identify the at least one predefined print job category. (column 8, lines 2-7).

Regarding claim 43, Buckley discloses wherein the analyzing includes sorting the drawing commands on each page of the print job by command type, and grouping the sorted drawing commands into predetermined object types so as to identify a percentage of the drawing commands in the print job that is associated with each of the predetermined object types. (column 8, lines 2-7).

Regarding claim 44, Buckley discloses wherein the categorizing includes comparing the percentage of the drawing commands associated with each of the predetermined object types against predefined percentages associated with the pre-specified categorization criteria so as to identify a category for the print job. (column 8, lines 2-7).

II. Claims 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,970) in view of Buckley (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,173) in view of Barrett (U.S. Patent No. 5,323,393).

Regarding claim 14, the Suzuki and Buckley reference discloses the analysis of print data using a printer driver.

It does not explicitly disclose "The method of claim 5, further including: processing the log file so as to characterize printing usage."

However, Barrett discloses in column 14 lines 37-68 to column 15, lines 1-9, that the statistical log information and the enhanced print service management can read on processing the log file to characterize printing usage.

All references are combinable because both are in the art of optimizing print jobs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have an account of the usage information of a printing device if one were to have additional information in the log file such as that of the Barrett reference.

The motivation would have been to allow one to know what types and number of prints were printed so that one can know how to further optimize printing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use all references to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claim 22, the Suzuki and Buckley reference discloses the analysis of print data using a printer driver.

It does not explicitly disclose "the client monitoring program is preprogrammed to send an error message to a user attempting to initiate the print job blocking all print jobs that are classified with unknown designations.

However, Barrett discloses in column 24, lines 37-40 that an LED signal informs an user of an error.

All references are combinable because both are in the art of optimizing print jobs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have signaled an user of an error before printing.

The motivation would have been to allow one to know that a document is about to be printed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use all references to obtain the invention as specified.

III. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,970) in view Buckley (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,173) in view of Inoue et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,835)

Regarding claims 38 and 39, Suzuki and Buckley discloses a way to identify objects and categorize print jobs.

It does not explicitly disclose "wherein the categorizing denotes a print job category for the print job, the method further comprising inhibiting printing of the print job if the print job category matches a predefined category and further comprising informing an administrator if the print job category matches a predefined category."

However, Inoue et al discloses in Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 34-67 that printing of illegal documents can be prevented and a manager can be warned.

All references are combinable because both are in the art of identification and categorization of images.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have improved the Buckley invention with a counterfeiting mechanism.

The motivation would have been to prevent users from printing certain documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all references to obtain the invention as specified.

IV. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,970) in view of Buckley (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,173) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in the background of the invention ("background").

Regarding claim 40, Suzuki and Buckley discloses the printing of a print job according to a particular category.

It does not explicitly disclose "wherein the categorizing denotes a print job category for the print job, the method further comprising providing an incentive to a user if the print job category matches a predefined category."

However, the background states on page 4, lines 20-28 the offering of incentives to people based upon printing habits.

All references are combinable because both are in the art of producing print jobs according after categorizing them for optimal printing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have improved Buckley's invention with an incentive program.

The motivation would have been to reward users for printing certain documents and to attract further usage from those users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all references to obtain the invention as specified.

V. Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,970) in view of Buckley (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,173) in view of Bennett et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,146,344).

The Suzuki and Buckley references disclose ways to categorize print data.

It does not explicitly disclose "wherein the categorizing denotes a print job category for the print job, the method further comprising billing a user according to a price associated with the print job category and wherein different print job categories have different prices."

However, Bennett discloses in Figs. 8A-8B and column 6, lines 18-46 that users can be charged for prints according to various billing rates.

All references are combinable because both are in the art of determination of print job types.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have improved Buckley's invention and to have an accounting system.

The motivation would have been to appropriately charge users for printing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all references to obtain the invention as specified.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yixing Qin whose telephone number is (571)272-7381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YQ

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625